

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1989 AT 10:00 A.M.,
IN BC-110, SGW CAMPUS

ATTENDANCE: Present were:

J.N. Lightstone (Chair), V. Baba, U. De Bretani,
M. Lefevre, B. MacKay, G. Mergen, J. Segovia,
M.N.S. Swamy, A.J. Williams

Absent with regrets:

K. Lipke, P. Albert, D. Gold, S. Sankar

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED & DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE:

In Advance:

SRC-89-09-07-D71	Proposal for the Establishment of a Faculty (Rev. 12 Sept. 89) Research Development Programme
SRC-89-10-05-D74	Composition of the Senate Research Committee 1989-90

At the Meeting:

SRC-89-10-05-D75	Memo from P. Albert to J. Lightstone (Sept. 25, 1989) Re: Centre Interuniversitaire en calcul mathematique algebrique
SRC-89-10-05-D79	Memo from J. Lightstone to P. Kennliff (Sept. 25, 1989) Re: Centre Interuniversitaire en calcul mathematique algebrique
SRC-89-10-05-D76	Issues for Study and Action by Senate Research Committee 1989-90

Documents Distributed at the Meeting (cont.)

SRC-89-10-05-D77	Procedures for Evaluating Research Centres Seeking Formal Recognition by the University
SRC-89-10-05-D78 (Rev. 4 Oct. 89)	Proposal for the Establishment of a Faculty Research Development Programme
SRC-89-10-05-D83	Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science REPORT of the Committee on Aid to Research Activity for Its Second Year of Operations
SRC-89-10-05-D80	Faculty of Commerce and Administration Report of the 1988-1989 Faculty Research Committee
SRC-89-10-05-D81	Faculty of Fine Arts Report on Allocation of Seed Grants and Travel Money to Conferences 1988-89
SRC-89-10-05-D82	Faculty of Arts and Science REPORT of the Research Advisory Committees for the Distribution of General Research Funds 1988-89

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1.1 Ms. Williams requested that the following revision be made to Item 8.2 of page 4: "It was announced that the preliminary results for the first quarter only for 1989-90 show an increase of over two million dollars".

1.2 B. McKay requested that the following revisions be made to Document SRC-89-10-05-D74 (20 Sept. 1989).

Prof. B. MacKay, Associate Dean, Fine Arts
Prof. K. Lipke, Fine Arts

The document will be revised to show these changes as well as the presence of Mr. Mark Lefevre, Graduate Student, M.Sc. Chemistry.

1.3 The Committee agreed to approve the minutes, as corrected.

II. CHAIR'S REMARKS

2.1 The Chair had no particular remarks that were not covered by the Agenda.

III. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTRES
Document: SRC-89-10-05-D77

- 3.1 Dr. Lightstone commented that the document, "Guidelines for the Evaluation of Research Centres," approved by Senate in the Spring of 1989, made no provisions for implementing its policies regarding evaluation leading to formal recognition of a research centre. This document is an attempt to set up a standard process using an ad hoc evaluation committee; the proposed procedures are similar to that currently used to evaluate proposals for new Doctoral programmes.
- 3.2 Dean Swamy stated that it was unclear who would initiate the proposed process. He suggested that the relevant Faculty Council(s) would ask Senate to strike an ad hoc evaluation committee and to set in motion, the evaluation process, leading to Senate's recognition. The committee's recommendations will be forwarded to the SRC and Senate for action, not the Faculty Councils, which will have already indicated their support of the centre.
- 3.3 The Chair indicated that the basis on which the Faculty Councils made their recommendations should be stipulated.
- 3.4 After some discussion, the decision was, in effect, to leave the process as a senate process and remove the Faculty Councils from the procedural chart. Requests for initiating the process will be made by the Faculty Councils involved.
- 3.5 V. Baba requested that the following revisions be made to page 2 of the document:
 - (Criteria to be Applied)
 - 2) The quality of graduate and undergraduate education afforded within the centre will be assessed.
 - (The Work of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee)
 - 2) Consider a dossier prepared by the centre in accordance with the specifications required by the various granting agencies, i.e. FCAR, NSERC, etc., for Centre Grant applications.
- 3.6 V. Baba also noted that a time frame should be specified from the point of request.

3.7 Dean Swamy noted that the following clarifications should be made to page 3 regarding the composition of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee:

- 4) Two faculty members, who are not members of the centre, to be named by each Faculty Council to which the report will be submitted for action.
- 5) One faculty member, outside of the centre's faculty, to be named by the Senate.

3.8 Ms. Williams requested the following statement be included on page 2 under the work of the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee:

- 5) will consider the recommendation(s) from the Faculty Councils involved.

IV. FACULTY RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (Document SRC-89-10-05-D78)

4.1 The Chair remarked that the document presented was discussed in a number of meetings, including the Senate Steering Committee's meeting, and the document presented has evolved with the positive feedback from these meetings.

4.2 The Chair clarified that a query expressed by many was whether the priorities established by the Faculties would be overridden at subsequent levels. He had assured all that the purpose of the University-wide committee was to additionally highlight proposals which may not have reflected Faculty priorities, but which did meet University priorities.

4.3 The Chair stated that the "Start-Up" program, while not meant or able to solve our recruitment problems, would have enough built-in flexibility to allow it to help in the area of recruitment. He suggested that consideration of proposals for the "Start-Up" Grants should precede the consideration of proposals for "Targeted" Research Grants by approximately six months, so as to eliminate direct competition between the two. Although this is not written into the proposal, it is to be expected in the process.

- 4.4 At a meeting of the Rectors and Vice Rectors, it was decided that a statement indicating the source of funding should accompany the proposal to Senate. The statement would, among other things, indicate a commitment to provide the funds for this program without cutting existing programmes or budgets.

V. TWO YEAR MANDATE

Document: SRC-89-10-05-D76

The Chair asked the Committee Members to ponder the draft document. He then asked that members:

1. Respond to the items which they do not feel should be included in the mandate;
2. Identify areas which they felt were missing from the mandate;
3. Might choose to draw up a short position statement (maximum of two pages single-spaced) regarding any of the areas.

This information would become the departure point for further discussion.

VI. NOMINATION OF TWO FACULTY MEMBERS AT LARGE

As specified in the last Minutes of the meeting, the Chair provided the Committee with several nominees for the vacant position in the humanities. It was agreed that the following faculty members will be approached in the subsequent order:

Dr. D.E. Ginter, Professor, History
 Dr. C. Allen, Assoc. Professor, Philosophy
 Dr. S. Mullett, Assoc. Professor, Philosophy

With regards to the remaining vacancy, Dean Swamy suggested the inclusion of a faculty member from Computer Science, who was not in an applied area. At present, he felt that only the engineering side of the faculty is currently being represented, and that the inclusion of a member who was not an applied scientist would be an asset to the Committee.

The final consensus was that if a computer scientist was to be nominated for the position, it should be someone who could be readily associated with the Mathematics Department.

In order to expedite this issue quickly, the list of nominees for this position will be circulated by mail as soon as possible.

VII. DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH SERVICES - A.J. WILLIAMS

- 7.1 Ms. Williams provided the Committee with copies of the four Faculty Research Committee Reports, detailing the internal distribution of research funds for the period of 1988-89. She thanked the committee members for their expedience in preparing the reports.
- 7.2 It was reported that the number of new team applications to FCAR decreased from thirty-two last year, to twenty-four this year. The number of new applicants to SSHRC appears to have remained the same. NSERC applications are starting to be received.
- 7.3 Ms. Williams announced that the report to the National Research Council from Roch Prud'Homme, Director of UQAM-R&D-CONCORDIA, is almost complete. Copies will be given to committee members in the near future. This report will be used to request continued funding for the office. The Director of Research Services announced that the possibility for renewed funding does not look favourable.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- 8.1 Please note that Documents SRC-89-10-05-80 through SRC-89-10-05-83 were numbered after distribution. Please mark the corresponding number on your documents to prevent confusion.
- 8.2 The next Senate Research Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 2nd at 10:00 A.M., in Room BC-110.

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 A.M.